

Remarks/Arguments:

Introduction

Claims 1, 3-20, 23, 24, and 43-50 are pending. Claims 41 and 42 have been canceled. Claims 6, 9-19, and 23 are withdrawn. Claims 43-50 have been added. Support for newly added claim 43 may be found in previously presented claim 7, in particular the “preferred” features previously claimed. Support for newly added claims 44 and 46 may be found in previously presented claim 8, in particular the “preferred” features previously claimed. Support for newly added claim 45 may be found in previously presented claim 8, in particular the “such as” features previously claimed. Support for newly added claims 48-50 may be found in paragraph [0022] of the published specification or at page 4, lines 22-29 of the application as filed.

The definition of the second portion in claim 1 has been amended to give antecedent basis for the phrase “the heat radiating surface”. The wording of claim 3 has been changed to make it clear that each of the electrical connectors has a printed surface board facing surface. Claim 20 has been made dependent on claim 3 where there is antecedent basis for the limitation “the formation of electrical connectors”. The phrase “the base support” in claim 20 has been replaced by “the first portion”.

No new matter is introduced with these amendments. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments presented herein obviate the concerns raised by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 06-350012 to Kurashima et al. (hereinafter "Kurashima"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For the convenience of the Examiner, a full translation of Kurashima is enclosed following the last page of the remarks.

Kurashima et al discloses an optical data link which uses a portion of the leadframe to shield the optical connector and circuit board. The circuit board is said to have an amplifier mounted on it as a component. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Kurashima et al of using the portion of the leadframe to shield a semiconductor assembly consisting of a semiconductor die or a plurality of semiconductor dies consisting of a first chip and one or more second chips stacked or flip-mounted thereon. The advantage of the mounted semiconductor assembly according to the invention is that improved shielding is obtained. In Kurashima et al, it is stated in paragraph [0030] at pages 9-10 and shown in Figure 9 that the crosstalk is reduced from 1.7dB to 1.2dB. In contrast, it is stated at paragraph [0219] of the present published application that the improvements in shield effectiveness obtained by the present invention are from 10dB to 20dB.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is mistaken in objecting that the feature of claim 5 is disclosed in Kurashima et al. The vertical connecting portion shown in Fig. 3c is similar to the connecting portion joining the first and second portions which is a feature of claim 1. Thus, it is not an additional edge portion arranged to extend when the mounting is folded beyond at least one edge of the first portion of the mounting.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present invention are patentably distinct over Kurashima. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kurashima. Applicants respectfully traverse.

While the Examiner acknowledges that Kurashima certain features of previously presented claim 7 are not disclosed in Kurashima, the Examiner rejects claim 7 as allegedly being obvious over Kurashima. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kurashima fails to disclose, teach or suggest then present invention as set forth in independent claims. Therefore, dependent claim 7 is patentably distinct over Kurashima. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct. Rejoinder of withdrawn claims 6, 9-19, and 23 is also respectfully requested. This application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is therefore respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning the above, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number given below.

Application No.: 10/583,525
Amendment and Response dated November 30, 2009
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2009
Docket No.: 1662-2 PCT/US
Page 11

An excess claim of \$156.00 is due for the presentation of six (6) additional claims, i.e., eight new presented claims less two claims canceled herein. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of \$156.00 or any additional fees associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2461. Such authorization includes authorization to charge fees for extensions of time, if any, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 and also should be treated as a constructive petition for an extension of time in this reply or any future reply pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

Respectfully submitted,

/John S. SOPKO, Reg. # 41,321/
John S. Sopko
Registration No.: 41,321
Attorney for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(973) 331-1700